UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

MAY **3 1** 2007

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES Ex parte GANESH MANI

Application 09/662,958

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was received electronically at the Board of Patent

Appeals and Interferences on May 4, 2007. A review of the application has revealed that the application is not ready for docketing as an appeal.

Accordingly, the application is herewith being electronically returned to the examiner. The matters requiring attention prior to docketing are identified below:

An Examiner's Answer was mailed on June 15, 2006.

Section § 1207.02 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) (8th Ed., Rev. 3, August 2005) states:

Requirements for Examiner's Answer

The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

. . . .

(8) Evidence Relied Upon. A listing of the evidence relied on (e.g., patents, publications, admitted prior art), and, in the case of nonpatent references, the relevant page or pages.

It is noted that while the Examiner's Answer states that "[n]o evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal" [page 2 under the caption "(8) Evidence Relied Upon"], the claim rejection is listed as follows:

Claims 1-70 and 90-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,862,223 in view of Lloyd, U.S. Patent No. 4,876,648 [page 3].

Before further review, the examiner must mail a PTOL-90 that will include in the amended Evidence Relied Upon section, the list of references mentioned in the Grounds of Rejections. See the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, (MPEP) § 1207.02. Appropriate correction is required.

Application 09/662,958

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) issue and mail a PTOL-90 having the missing references listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section, heading (8) of the Examiner's Answer; and
 - 2) for such further action as may be appropriate.

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

By: Paterick INO Ca

PATRICK J. NOLAN

Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator

(571) 272-9797

PJN:psb

David C. Jenkins Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot LLC 600 Grant Street 44th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219